attracting more and more attention, it is a matter of congratulation that so competent and careful a book is available. It will also be joyously welcomed by instructors in college classes on labor problems who have heretofore had to refer their students to numerous treatises, most of which are antiquated both in matter and point of view.

GEORGE E. BARNETT.

Johns Hopkins University.

Industrial Arbitration. A World-Wide Survey of Natural and Political Agencies for Social Justice and Industrial Peace. By CARL H. MOTE. (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 1916. Pp. 351, xlv. $1.50.)

One has but to look at the history of arbitration during the last century to ask why it should ever have inspired so fervid and so obstinate an enthusiasm. It had its successes, quite enough to justify all attendant costs. It was, at the same time, shadowed by failures so constant and of such character as to raise doubts which seem never to have been met. Extremely able students and men of practical mastery in business, continued to present arbitration together with boards of conciliation as a final remedy for industrial wrangling.

"Only work out the Principles a little more prudently: only be more wary in the choice of chairman, and disputes can be reduced to a trifling minimum." Especially in France, where small industries were so long the rule, arbitration has a history showing how every peace-making device is compelled to change with each shift in the technique of industry. It must also change with the growth of organization both among employers and employed. In a large part of the nineteenth century, the French and English were always attempting to keep pace with these growths and variations. Yet these revolutions in technique and organization are but one element in the perplexities which beset the formal (arbitration) and the informal (conciliation) efforts to secure peace in industry. A change more embarrassing still is the altered mood and aim of labor.

One has but to ask, for example, what will happen when determining majorities inside and outside labor organizations honestly come to believe that wages should not, as heretofore, follow prices, but that prices should follow wages. What will

happen when the principle of the minimum and the living wage gets wide practical acceptance? Every vital claim under arbitration will present new issues and new difficulties so far as these beliefs become real. England, in the seventies, shows us honest attempts to settle disputes in coal cases with direct reference to prevailing theories of wages. That wage determination should follow prices, there seemed no manner of doubt. The sliding scale was then in evidence. In a famous case in 1875, the "wage-fund" was openly used to justify the decision. Oftener still quite different theories jostle each other in the attempt to secure peace. More and more these attempts have been abandoned for social conceptions of "distributive-justice," "general welfare," and the like which take their place. A minimum income is now to be made a first charge upon industry.

This is not a mere socialistic or labor claim, it has express sanction of competent judges in the Australian courts: a wage sufficient "for the healthy subsistence of an average family." The real test for these new views can never be judged or even known until the principle has a far wider application than to restricted groups. The fact remains that they have so far won a place in the minds of men as to furnish a basis of active legislation in several countries. Powerful private firms and corporations of the highest class have definitely accepted and put in practice the living and the minimum wage. It is thus admitted that wages should be standardized according to some test of "decency, comfort, and leisure."

If it was risky to define the words "preferential" and "hiring" under the New York protocol, it was far more hazardous to state, to the satisfaction of both parties, what "a good union man" is. The attorney of the union put it plainly: "All we ask the manufacturers is to preserve the provisions of the preferential union shop *as we see it.*" "As we see it"—not as the employer sees it, not as the public sees it, nor as anybody sees it, but as the wage-earner sees it.

Now the above definitions are simplicity itself when compared to interpreting life standards of "decency, comfort, and leisure," under the organized pressure of powerful bodies convinced that wages should be a first lien on industry and the standard of "decency, comfort, and leisure" shall be determined "as we see it."

Mr. Mote's study shows in every chapter—history and appli-

cation alike—what these future entanglements may be for arbitration. Like our Massachusetts act, it will prove upon the whole worth while, but in no sense a "solution" to any of the deeper sources of industrial friction.

With appendix and index, the present volume contains 14 chapters professing to give "a world-wide survey of natural and political agencies for social justice and industrial peace." About half the book is given to European and Australian experience; the rest to our own country, with chapters on interstate strikes, on the Colorado strike, and on trade agreements.

It is made plain that neither the significance nor the promise of arbitration can be seen apart from the more important economic and legislative changes under which arbitration must act. There is again a good deal of discrimination in dealing with conditions differing as radically from our own as, for example, New Zealand. We are not only warned that New Zealand is primarily a farming community; that its population is not a quarter that of our largest city; that she has less than 75,000 factory operatives as against our 7,000,000 odd; that her population is homogeneous and her immigration well under control; but that labor is thoroughly organized and this organization is publicly "recognized." The conditions were thus propitious for so much "compulsion" as employers and labor unions were willing to accept by voluntary registration. The author states that from 1893 to 1911 there were but 42 strikes, a little more than half of which were outside the scope of the law.

The reader is a good deal perplexed by Mr. Mote's use of such terms as "social justice" left without any adequate defining. Perhaps the nearest he comes to definition is in a closing passage on New Zealand's famous act. Though we are made fully aware of the great limitations of arbitration and conciliation even in Australasia, the author says:

> Perhaps nothing so completely demonstrates the strength of the New Zealand system of arbitration and its underlying basis of social justice, as the Dominion's experiences with syndicalism and the efforts of the syndicalists to carry out a general strike, during the latter part of 1911, 1912, and 1913. The effort was a complete failure; and although more than fifty strikes were called during the period, all of them were lost.

And again we read (p. 326):

> Given a fairer measure of industrial equality, conciliation and arbitration by state agency will no longer be very necessary because

the two dominant factors in industry—Capital and Labor—will then have only minor matters for adjudication and these will be settled mutually without the interference of the state. Conciliation and arbitration as understood today presuppose a state of war between Capital and Labor. . . . Remove the cause of the conflict and industrial peace is sure to follow. It will follow too in certain ratio to progress in removing basic causes of the conflict.

The "cause of the conflict," "basic causes"—upon these obscurities, alas! we are given scarcely a ray of light. The author seems to be saying: "We cannot indeed dispense with the peace expedients, but no great result awaits us until "justice" and "industrial equality" have knit themselves in among our social habits; until "the worker has been set free economically." But of these misty ultimates we know far too little to turn them into remedies at this stage of the game.

These defects should by no means offset the real value with which Mr. Mote enriches his subject. An adequate historical survey is given, in which the spread and specialization of arbitration and conciliation show the service that has been rendered. For example, England in 1910 had 282 conciliation boards, 265 of them for particular trades and 17 for district or general boards. The amount of work thus appears. "In 1912, 22 disputes were settled under the conciliation act of 1896; 13 by particular boards of trade; 12 by district and general boards and trade councils; and 52, by voluntary conciliation and by individuals. In the same year, 2138 disputes were settled by permanent conciliation and arbitration boards and standing joint committees (p. 43).

In Germany, we read, "In a typical year, 1908, there were more than 1,000,000 cases of individual disputes between workmen and employers in the German Empire brought upon complaint of the workmen and about 6000 upon complaint of employers. Of this number, agreement was reached in nearly 50,000 cases." (See further, p. 85.)

Our own need of peace agencies appears in the author's statement that we in the United States have more strikes for a given number of industrial workers than Great Britain, France, or Germany—37,000 strikes from 1881 to 1905. In this period "less than five per cent of the strikes and lockouts were settled by arbitration."

The author yet holds that "the continual activity of a state board is a wholesome influence on both parties . . . and tends to create a compromising attitude among employers as well as among wage-earners." This is less encouraging than it seems because our state report for 1912 shows that a larger number of workmen were involved in strikes (in that year) than in any other year since 1881, when statistics were first compiled.

JOHN GRAHAM BROOKS.

Cambridge, Mass.

Summary of the Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States. Bulletin of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, whole number 175. (Washington, D. C.: 1916. Pp. 445.)

Various groups of persons, students, employers, social workers, and others interested in the problems connected with the employment of women and children will welcome this valuable summary of the 19 volumes that make up the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the *Condition of Woman and Child Wage Earners in the United States.*[1] It contains a series of summaries varying in length from 5 to 53 pages; but, in the words of the report, although "no complete summarization of these summaries has been attempted . . . some of the more significant points have been indicated, which appear not in any one volume but from a study of the report as a whole" (p. 15). It is, however, this "summary of summaries" that has been so much needed, for although the 19-volume report has been known to students as a mine of valuable information since its publication, it has not been of use to those who can not take time to collect laboriously the information they desire. Moreover, if the investigation was to be used as a basis for social legislation, it was necessary to have assembled the facts bearing upon such questions, for example, as long hours and low wages.

The writer of this review recalls the agitation carried on by the various women's organizations of this country to secure from Congress the appropriation which was necessary for this inquiry. These women wished an investigation which should show what measures were needed to improve the condition of the working women and children in this country. Two different plans were

[1] See AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW, vol. II, p. 436; vol. III, pp. 195, 985.